

## FLORIDA

Flode Jones, Deleon Springs.  
Edward A. Jensen, Pahokee.  
J. Alex Morrell, Umatilla.

## IDAHO

Ralph L. Woodard, Atlanta.  
Alice A. York, Carey.

## IOWA

Nelle M. Parsons, Letts.  
Joseph L. Lichty, Luverne.

## KANSAS

Thomas W. Moore, Republic.  
George L. Althouse, Sabetha.  
Lyell D. Ocobock, Scandia.

## MICHIGAN

William W. Jones, Franklin.  
Roy Mellon, Goodrich.  
Monica M. Parks, Highland.  
Walter C. Schoof, Imlay City.  
William M. Hankerd, Munith.  
John P. Shear, New Hudson.  
Frances A. Leece, Ortonville.

## MINNESOTA

Andrew Lubinski, Greenbush.  
Ray N. Tabaka, Longville.  
Maude E. Williams, Mora.  
Paul M. Saemrow, Morristown.

## NEBRASKA

Charles M. Brown, Sutton.

## NEVADA

Spencer E. Blackburn, Mountain City.

## NEW YORK

William E. Kreiger, Latham.  
Milly L. Hendershot, Sparrow Bush.

## OHIO

Charles H. Larrabee, Croton.  
Audrey M. Neptune, Farmersville.  
Eusebio Pera, Geneva-on-the-Lake.  
Clara E. Fleming, West Middletown.

## OREGON

Ruth E. Walter, Clackamas.  
George F. Kennedy, Seneca.  
Thomas G. Tucker, Umatilla.

## VIRGINIA

Ulys S. Staples, King George.  
William M. Walden, Saluda.  
Vernon L. Spence, Tangier.  
J. Howard Craig, Verona.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Charles G. Price, Smithfield.  
Swepson J. Richter, White Sulphur Springs.

## WYOMING

Anna P. Davis, Green River.  
Althea E. Rollins, Lyman.  
Frank L. Hunter, Osage.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thy word, O God, is with us: "Attend to know understanding; get wisdom and forget it not." We pray Thee, enable us to heed and clothe this divine injunction in the radiant vestments of gracious, consecrated activity, finding ourselves each step nearer the blessed ideal and nearer the deeper meaning of life's mission. Oh, let nothing come between us and the

light; free all minds from prejudice, for only in the tolerance of others do we really live. Permit not that sad day to come when material achievement has outrun the unaging sanctities of the immortal soul; let it ever be the sanctuary of the spirit of the son of man. In these forbidding days, we beseech Thee; hold us to the realization that evil may be wrought by the lack of thought, thus marring the divinity within our own natures. We praise Thee for the Infinite One, whom we may ever approach, but never surpass—the dateless, timeless Christ who is the same yesterday, today, and forever. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 2, 1940, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Pan American Cotton Congress;

S. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution extending the time for submitting the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee; and

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution authorizing the erection of an additional stand for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States, on January 20, 1941.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a short statement.

The membership will understand that I am in my eleventh month of this year in Washington. As we are not adjourning sine die and as it appears there will be little to do in the House until a message may be received from the President within a week or something like that, the Chair desires at this time to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] in order that he may offer a resolution to elect a Speaker pro tempore, in the absence of the Speaker, as I do desire just a few days of holiday between now and the beginning of what may be a long session in January.

I will probably be back before you will want to adjourn for the holidays, if you do.

I wish you all, as you go away, a pleasant trip home and that you will all be back in fine fettle in January. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 641

*Resolved*, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

*Resolved*, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the question of the reapportionment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWE, by unanimous consent, was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, since the effective date of Reorganization Plan No. IV, which provided for the abolition of the Air Safety Board and the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce, three major air-line disasters have occurred, air-line disasters in which the passenger fatalities have been something terrific. Prior to these important changes nearly a year and a half passed without a single passenger fatality on the air lines—a splendid record.

I am presenting a resolution to the House today which I wish I could offer for immediate consideration, calling for the appointment of a special investigating committee and its immediate investigation into the causes of these disasters and into any other questions that may relate thereto. As there are about 30 days before the convening of the next Congress, it seems to me that this committee could obtain in that time all the necessary information to present to the House in order to aid in stemming this tide of accidents.

The first of this series of accidents occurred at Lovettsville, Va., on August 31, 1940, when 25 lives were lost, the entire list of crew and passengers, including the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, our friend the Honorable Ernest Lundeen. This accident occurred in an electrical rain squall. The second disaster was that of an air liner which flew off course in a snowstorm in Utah on November 4, 1940, and piled up on a mountain top. Here 10 lives, the entire list of passengers and crew, were lost. The third occurred yesterday, December 4, 1940, as an air liner, which had been forced to circle the field at Chicago for 28 minutes because of traffic, and in conditions of ice and sleet, plummeted to the ground in landing. It fell perhaps 150 feet, but many lives have been lost and others hang in the balance of fate.

I beg your cooperation, Mr. Speaker, if it is within the province of the Speaker to do so, in order to aid in promoting this immediate investigation to help prevent such accidents and to determine the future course of civil aeronautics. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks four times in the RECORD, as follows:

First, by inserting an address delivered in New York by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] at the annual dinner of the Association of American Railroads.

Second, to include an article by Dr. William Jennings Price, of Danville, Ky., and Washington, D. C., entitled "Danville Was the First Post Office Established in Kentucky and in the Territory Beyond the Alleghenies."

Third, an address by former Chief Justice Edward C. O'Rear, of Kentucky, on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Supreme Court of the United States, entitled "Supreme Court Justice Thomas Todd, the Man."

Fourth, resolutions adopted at a memorial session of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky in commemoration of the life and public service of the late Senator M. M. Logan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted at the twentieth annual convention, California-Nevada District of Kiwanis International, Santa Barbara, Calif., in which a proposed amendment to the immigration and naturalization law is suggested.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the House is completed today I may address the House for 15 minutes, following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote very briefly from an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD; and, second, after the conclusion of the other special orders for the day that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend my own remarks in reference to the C. C. C. program; and, second, to extend my remarks with reference to the continuation of the food-stamp plan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by C. B. Whitney, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech by Judge Hall, of the superior court of Los Angeles, in connection with the induction of the first men into the selective service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an address delivered by John C. Page, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein letters addressed to me by Hon. Dean Acheson, chairman of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article on the Poles, by Cedric Larson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein two short newspaper articles.



The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of House Joint Resolution 610, entitled "Prepare for Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter which I am addressing today to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 20 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders on the subject of cotton warehousing and wheat concentration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### AIRPORT FACILITIES AT CHICAGO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been endeavoring to emphasize the need for improved aircraft facilities and additional landing fields in the Chicago area. Chicago is the hub of the Nation. It is the point where East meets West.

Nothing more graphically indicates the need for better aviation facilities in Chicago than the airplane crash reported in the press this morning. I find among the list of those killed and injured several of my personal acquaintances.

The major cause of this unfortunate accident was the fact that the United Airlines plane was unable to land when it reached the municipal airport. Mr. Harold Crary, vice president of the United Airlines, is quoted as saying:

A light snow was falling when the plane arrived and it circled the airport for 28 minutes, waiting for the traffic-control department to give clearance into the airport.

Imagine a condition where a passenger plane must fly back and forth across an airport for approximately a half hour before it can land at its destination because of the heavy traffic at the landing field.

Congress has inaugurated a program for the development of airports in the United States. We have authorized an expenditure of \$30,000,000 for this purpose. I have repeatedly emphasized the need for improved facilities in the Chicago area, and I sincerely hope that the Civil Aeronautics Authority will now recognize this need.

On a number of occasions during the last few years, both before my Committee on Naval Affairs and on the floor of the House, I have urged aircraft development. I have spoken not only of enlargement of our air-defense forces, but I have endeavored to emphasize the importance of creating underground hangars and the moving of airplane factories inland for defense purposes. I am one of those who has supported the program for enlarging existing airports and building new ones.

This airplane accident shows how great this need, is and it shows, beyond any doubt whatsoever, that new and improved airport facilities are needed in the Chicago area. I am quite unable to understand why new airports should be built in isolated spots, save perhaps for political purposes, when a great industrial and transportation center is without adequate facilities to meet present demands. It was the absence of adequate facilities which caused the crash last night and cost the lives of several of my personal acquaintances.

#### UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4370) authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The compensation of the Assistant Secretary of War shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my purpose to object, the House about a year ago passed a bill covering the case of a doctor and his family who were injured by a drunken driver and a truck. A bill passed the House to give them some relief. It went to the Senate and was passed by the Senate. There was a conference report, which has been here a long time. We cannot get consideration of the conference report. There ought to be something done about matters like that. No one apparently is willing to call it up.

The SPEAKER. It has not been called to the attention of the Chair. Nobody has moved to take it up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand that under the rules of the House nobody can bring it up except the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to call it up, it can be brought up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I will do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky, if the chairman of the Claims Committee is not present, for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same matter that was brought up here the other day?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know whether any other department or body of the Government has taken any action on the Smith amendments we sent over to the Senate a long time ago?

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know what the other body is doing about the Smith amendments. This bill has nothing to do with that matter, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think they ought to do something about them while we are waiting here?

Mr. COSTELLO. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. It would be proper for them to take up and consider the Smith amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any way that we can get the Smith amendments considered over there?

Mr. COSTELLO. I am afraid that is rather difficult for us.

Mr. COOPER. Get yourself elected to the Senate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is an impossible task, in view of the fact that the administration is spending so much money to elect people of its own political faith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Col. Sumpter Smith, Air Corps, Alabama National Guard, and air officer of the Thirty-first National Guard Division, has just resigned his position as special airport adviser to the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and as chairman of the Interdepartmental Engineering Commission for the Washington National Airport.

He has gone into the military service of the Nation to join the colors and take charge of the air service of his division.

The Washington National Airport is nearing completion. It will be open for landings within the next few days. It will go into full service next spring. It is said by competent authorities to be the finest air terminal in the United States. It has been built with remarkable expedition and economy. Colonel Smith was appointed, under the general supervision of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, to coordinate the activities of the several governmental agencies engaged in the design and construction of the Washington National Airport and to exercise general supervision of design and construction. Therefore, to him must be paid a large part of the commendation due for this signal achievement.

Colonel Smith brought to bear upon this task, entrusted to him by the President of the United States, a skill and experience which belies his years. Although still a young man, with the enthusiasm of youth, he has participated as engineer in charge or consultant in design, construction, or improvement of more than 650 airports—probably the widest experience any man has ever had in such work.

His career as a builder of airports has reached its high-water mark in his work for the Washington National Airport. Its beauty and utility will soon be demonstrated. All honor to him, his superiors, and the cooperating agencies who have labored together in this achievement, in which there is glory enough for all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement made by former President Hoover on the subject of America and the famine in the five little democracies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

#### HJALMAR M. SEBY

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3729) for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby be taken from the Speaker's desk and given immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the bill covers?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman this bill covers a claim by Mr. Hjalmar M. Seby, a contractor, of Abilene, Tex., against the Federal Government which was originally \$31,000. It was in connection with the extension and remodeling of a United States post-office building at Vernon, Tex., for which Mr. Seby had been awarded a contract.

A difference between Mr. Seby and an agent of the United States Government. The agent claimed that Mr. Seby had violated the N. I. R. A. Code. As a result, an affidavit was made by the agent of the Federal Government, a warrant issued, and Mr. Seby was arrested. The Federal grand jury, however, upon hearing the evidence, refused to return an indictment against Mr. Seby. Finally, after being harassed and annoyed by the agent of the Government, Mr. Seby's contract was canceled and his tools and equipment taken over by the Federal Government and never returned to him. The tools and equipment so taken being itemized and valued at \$9,864 as shown by the committee's report accompanying this bill. Furthermore, Mr. Seby was entitled to \$6,218.90 additional for work which he had completed under the contract and for which he had not been paid.

The bill, as I have heretofore stated, was originally for \$31,000, and was reduced in the Senate to \$14,369.61. There was a complete and exhaustive discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate concerning this measure and it was passed over there unanimously.

The bill was brought up last Monday, but was objected to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], who has since studied the report and has authorized me over the telephone, just a few moments ago, to say to the Members of the House that it is a most meritorious bill and should pass. He further authorized me to say that he had no objection whatever and if it was agreeable to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], it was certainly agreeable with him that the bill be passed.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] is one of the official objectors on the Private Calendar, and he objected to the bill when it was called up last week. He stated at that time there was an adverse report from the Department, and that the bill was not meritorious. If he has investigated and finds he was in error, of course I would not want to object.

Mr. GARRETT. I give the gentleman my word that Mr. HANCOCK told me, not 5 minutes ago over the telephone, that whatever the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] agreed to was entirely agreeable with him.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this bill been on the Private Calendar for some time? Has it been before the House before?

Mr. GARRETT. Not a great while. It has been before the House before, on last Monday, as I indicated a moment ago. However, it has not been on the calendar very long for the reason that the Committee on Claims did not have many meetings after July, but they all favor this measure. In the absence of some five or six of the ranking members of the committee, I am bringing the bill up today. The members of the committee are heartily in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems that there is quite an amount of money involved here. It does not seem to be proper procedure just to bring it up and pass it without having any particular discussion about it, and without knowing something about it.

Mr. GARRETT. I shall be glad to discuss and explain the bill in detail if the gentleman desires and if time will permit.

Mr. PITTENGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that I have gone into this bill very carefully, although I have no personal interest in it whatever. I am a member of the committee. This was one of the last bills to come over from the Senate. Unfortunately, there was not a companion House bill. This accounts for the delay. I know of no more meritorious bill that has ever been before this body than this one. I am giving the gentleman my word for that, and I can stand here for 20 minutes demonstrating those facts.

Mr. GARRETT. May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that the beneficiary under this bill is an elderly gentleman, probably 61 years of age, and because of this injustice done him has been prevented from continuing his contracting business? He has not only been absolutely ruined financially but is broken both in spirit and in health. Furthermore, although this is not necessarily material to the bill under discussion, Mr. Seby is an ex-service man and was a commissioned officer in the first World War. He is highly recommended by dozens of the finest citizens and leading business concerns of Abilene, Tex., where he has been in the contracting business for many years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How long has it been since this damage occurred?

Mr. GARRETT. It was about the year 1934, I believe.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Six years ago?

Mr. GARRETT. Something like that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And this matter is just now brought before the Congress?

Mr. GARRETT. He has had the matter up with quite a few attorneys and there was some disagreement as to the procedure; they have disagreed on the procedure to follow.



For that reason it is barred by limitation from going into the Court of Claims. For that reason there is no other way for Mr. Seby to be reimbursed other than by a private bill. This is certainly a just claim, and I most sincerely hope that there will be no objection to the passage of this bill. I can vouch for that personally, because I have studied it for hours and hours. Incidentally, I am in possession of a letter from my predecessor to Mr. Seby in which he states that his claim for \$31,000 is a just one and that he would introduce a bill in Congress to collect this amount for him as that was the only way in which it could be collected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to be the only Member of the House to object to its consideration, but I just do not like this kind of procedure.

Mr. GARRETT. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] in objecting to the passage of the bill last Monday gave as his reason the fact that he had not had time to read the report. Since that time he has been furnished and has read the report and has also, I believe, read a brief on the case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$14,369.61 to Hjalmar M. Seby, general contractor, of Abilene, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and losses sustained by him at the hands of representatives of the United States Government through (1) unjust cancellation of contract No. 4646, United States Government Form No. P. W. A. 51, for extension and remodeling United States post-office building, Vernon, Tex., known as Public Works Administration project No. 41; (2) failure of United States Government representatives to pay him for work done and materials furnished; (3) improper interference by United States Government representatives with him in the performance of his functions and duties as contractor under contract beforementioned; and (4) confiscation by United States Government representatives of materials and tools belonging to said Hjalmar M. Seby: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "him", strike out the remainder of line 8 and down through the word "for" in line 11, and insert "as the result of his entering into a Government contract, No. TL5A-4646, dated November 28, 1933, in connection with the."

Page 2, line 3, after "remodeling", insert "of."

Line 5, strike out the semicolon after "41" and down through the word "Seby" in line 12.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

#### INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 56

*Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That, in order to conform to the seating accommodations for the inaugural ceremonies in 1937, the Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the east plaza of the Capitol on January 20, 1941, be, and it is hereby, authorized to have erected, under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, an additional stand, the expenses of which shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I recall, when the matter of the expenses of the inaugural ceremonies was given consideration before the election, by the committees, first, by the Committee on Ac-

counts, of which the gentleman from Missouri is a member, and later by the Committee on Appropriations, which appropriated the money, it was felt that in view of the conditions existing in the country, in view of the large Treasury deficit, and in view of the necessities of the Treasury, the amount involved should be reduced, and the committee did reduce slightly, the amount formerly appropriated for inaugural purposes. As I understand and recall, that action met with the hearty approbation of the press and the people of the country. In view of our financial condition, the people of the country do not expect a lavish and expensive inaugural ceremony in Washington this year.

As I recall, the amount of \$35,000 was appropriated. This bill would increase the appropriation in order that additional seating capacity might be made available for the few who are successful in getting tickets from their Members of Congress and their Senators. I do not believe that it is good policy to authorize at this time the construction of 7,000 additional seats, the cost to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country, in order that a few more favored people in Washington may have grandstand seats during the inaugural ceremony. These seats will be used but a few minutes at most. Therefore why should the Government borrow the money to build them. There is no logical answer.

The gentleman from Missouri is always talking about economy. Here is a chance for a practical demonstration. When I know that he realizes the predicament the country is in, as far as national defense is concerned, it seems to me he should be the last man in the world to come here and ask for this money out of the Treasury in order that he, and I, possibly—if I am so fortunate—may get a few more reserved seat tickets to give to our constituents. The mass of the people will be standing. This should be a peoples' inauguration and no favorites should be played.

This is a small matter, of course, but we are only going to get anywhere with economy if we commence to whittle. Every dollar necessary for essentials, but not a dollar for luxuries. I should like to know the reasons the gentleman has for thinking that what I have said is not material and should not be observed.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Michigan is only in part correct. The Committee on Accounts did not consider this matter. The Committee on Appropriations did. It was later disclosed that due to the increased prices of materials, there will be approximately 4,500 seats less in front of the Capitol for the inauguration this year than there were previously, not only during the Roosevelt inaugurations but during the Hoover inauguration, the Coolidge inauguration, and the Harding inauguration.

As a result of this, it appears that the Members of Congress will receive under present arrangements four or possibly five tickets. I do not recall exactly the number of tickets they received in prior inaugurations, but I know the number I received was not in keeping with the demands, and now you have a situation where you are going to inaugurate a President for the first time in the history of the country for a third term, and there is more than the usual interest. I know there are going to be a large number of people from the gentleman's State who will want to see this inauguration. They will want to see the President sworn in. I do not know whether \$7,000 is involved or \$6,000, although I do not think it will cost more than \$7,000, but \$3,500 of that amount would come out of the contingent fund of the House, and \$3,500 would come out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

I have discussed the matter with the ranking Republican member on the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] who is present, and who is in favor of the concurrent resolution. At the gentleman from Michigan's suggestion I also discussed the matter with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

This, of course, is a matter for the House to decide. As far as I am concerned I will find a way to get along if I do not get any tickets, much as I would like a liberal supply, but you are inaugurating the President of the United States, and the question involved is whether you want your constituents and

my constituents to have the same privilege from the standpoint of seating capacity at the inauguration in January that they had in 1937 and in 1933, and also at the time Mr. Harding and Mr. Coolidge were inaugurated.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, conditions in the country are a little different right now. If the country is not actually in war it is perilously near war. The Congress has been scraping the bottom of the barrel to get funds for national defense. Times are different now. Every dollar the Congress spends it must borrow.

Mr. COCHRAN. They are not any worse now.

Mr. MICHENER. At the time Mr. Coolidge was inaugurated the country was prosperous, and we were reducing taxes, and had been reducing them throughout the Harding administration. There was a surplus in the Treasury and today there is a deficit. At the time Mr. Hoover was inaugurated the same condition existed. At the time Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated the first time there was a slight deficit. At the time Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated the second time there was an appalling deficit, and now we have the third term, which the gentleman suggests is unique, and should be given special attention. The deficit has climbed and climbed until now it is around \$49,000,000,000, and nobody knows where the top of this deficit is going to be at the end of the third term. It seems to me that if we follow the program of the gentleman from Missouri, when the fourth term comes, where will it be? I do not agree with him that special rejoicing should be indulged in because of the breaking the third term principle. I am opposed to additional appropriations to spectacularize that occurrence.

Mr. COCHRAN. We might get all the way over to the Supreme Court and the Library for the fourth term [laughter], but right now I will tell the gentleman from Michigan that under the present arrangement you are not going to have sufficient space for the members of the House and Senate Press Galleries, who are entitled to enter the House and Senate Press Galleries, and they certainly should have seats at the inauguration.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, of course the press should have ample seats. Those seats have already been provided for. For my part, instead of having 4 or 5 people from my district, I shall probably have 200 or 300, and I do not know that I am doing myself any good or anybody else any good in giving 4 of them seats while the other 296 who come down here for the inauguration are obliged to stand with the masses. I think it would be better if we did not have a single grandstand. The President should come up here in the spirit of humility and be sworn in without all this show and ostentation, without all this expense, without all this grandstand, without all this pomp and regal splendor, and without all this useless expenditure of money at a time when dollars are bigger than horse blankets to every man in America. Let us put the money in defense. The boys in the camps will not have such luxuries. This is still a democracy.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is no useless expenditure of money in arranging a proper setting for the inauguration of a President of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has made a somewhat lengthy talk, one that is very sensible and very convincing. However, he seems not to have been able to convince himself to the point of being willing to object; but he has convinced me, and I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. I wanted the gentleman to have an opportunity to make a speech.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 306) extending the time for submitting the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to create a temporary national economic committee," approved June 16, 1938, the time for submitting the final report of such committee is hereby extended to April 3, 1941, and the unexpended balances of the appropriations made for such committee shall be available to it until such date for the purpose of making such report.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is self-explanatory, I believe. It proposes an extension of the time allowed by the original resolution in which the Temporary National Economic Committee may make its report. The investigation authorized to be conducted by that committee has been completed, but due to the prolonged session and the general demand upon the time of Members, with which you are all familiar, the committee has not been able, and will not be able within the time allowed by the resolution, to make as helpful a report as it feels ought to be made.

This resolution calls for no additional expenditure. I am advised that the organization of the committee has been cut down to not more than 12 people. There is enough money that has already been allocated to this committee to carry forward the work of completing its report.

With the permission of the House, I would like to make this additional statement. This resolution has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, which had jurisdiction in the first instance with reference to the main resolution, and I believe was unanimously agreed to by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I just wanted to state that. There are some Members who have suggested to me that they were opposed to continuing this matter. I hope there will be no objection, because this committee at one time had on its pay roll 162 employees, as I recall, the largest-staffed investigating committee ever created and operating in the Congress. The number is now 12. It is just a question of ending the work of the committee and making the final report.

I think that should be done and I hope there will be no objection on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House resolution was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, assuming the House is in session, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the special orders entered for that day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, GA. AND FLA.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4135) to legalize the construction by the State Highway Board of Georgia of a free highway bridge across the Withlacoochee River, between Valdosta, Ga., and Madison, Fla., at Horns Ferry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this bill the approval of the minority members of the committee?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It has been reported unanimously by the committee of the House. This is a Senate bill.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Highway Board of Georgia to complete construction, in accordance with plans accepted by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, of a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Withlacoochee River, between Valdosta, Ga., and Madison, Fla., at Horns Ferry, and to maintain and operate said bridge as a lawful structure subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3765) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this bill the approval of the committee?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It has.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman state what the bill is?

Mr. CHAPMAN. This is a bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge which was authorized by the Congress in 1934, to be built by a joint board of the State of Washington and the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oregon, authorized to be built by the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees by an act of Congress approved June 13, 1934, as amended, as heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved August 30, 1935, January 27, 1936, August 5, 1937, May 26, 1938, and August 5, 1939, are further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 13, 1940.

SEC. 2. That so much of section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 949, 950), which reads as follows: "or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. MARYS RIVER AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3934) authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is what is known as the Straits Bridge Commission?

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is right, I think.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not know it was coming up. The gentleman had not said anything about it. This bill would authorize the State of Michigan to build a 5-mile bridge across the straits. It would cost approximately twenty-six or twenty-seven million dollars. Practically every newspaper in Michigan south of Grand Rapids is bitterly opposed to it, as are the people of those communities. In the northern part

of the State one or two districts are for it. Two or three of the Members from Michigan, however, have made a strenuous fight against this bill. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], one of those opponents.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not really fully understand the purpose of the bill, because it has not been explained. I supposed that this matter had passed the House, and I do not understand why it is back here.

Mr. CHAPMAN. This is a Senate bill, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, accompanied by the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The gentleman of course is thoroughly familiar with the bill, has discussed it many times. It would authorize the State of Michigan to construct a bridge or series of bridges or causeways across the St. Marys River.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, if the gentleman has stated the title of the bill correctly I do not believe it is the bill we had in mind. Is this the Straits bill or some other bill?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It would authorize the construction of a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto across the St. Marys River from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

Mr. MICHENER. This is another proposition entirely. I am not familiar with it. Do I understand it comes to the House with a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It does.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman know of any Member of Congress from Michigan who opposes the bill?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has opposed one bill, but I do not believe this is the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this is an entirely different proposition, located 75 miles from the Mackinac Straits bridge. This bill therefore has nothing to do with the so-called Straits bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] was opposed to the other bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that if he has any more of these bills he follow the custom, the practice, and the understanding in the House of consulting this side before he attempts to call them up by unanimous consent.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, every custom and practice of this House has been followed in this instance. This is brought to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Members of both sides on the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. I might remind the gentleman that he has not conferred with anybody on this side of the House with reference to calling this bill up by unanimous consent, and that is the custom. To pass legislation by unanimous consent is a harsh method.

Mr. CHAPMAN. This is the last bill. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MICHENER. It places one in a rather peculiar position. Not knowing anything about the bill I do not want to be put in the position of objecting to a meritorious bill. If the gentleman will follow the usual custom in these matters then situations like this would not arise.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the orders of the committee I should always consult the gentleman from Michigan in the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, or the successors to said authority, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, so far as the United States

has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, from a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, in the State of Michigan, to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Dominion of Canada.

(b) There is hereby conferred upon the State of Michigan and the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, or the successors to said authority, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Michigan needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations, or bridge authorities, or the State of Michigan, for bridge purposes in the State of Michigan, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

(c) The State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, or the successors to said authority, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, and the rates of toll shall be so fixed and adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 40 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of such bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SEATING AT THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request of a short while ago and now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 56

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That in order to conform to the seating accommodations for the inaugural ceremonies in 1937 the Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect of the United States on the east plaza of the Capitol on January 20, 1941, be, and it is hereby, authorized to have erected, under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, an additional stand, the expenses of which shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who is a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which considered the original item.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And I happen to be the ranking minority member of the committee present, or I would not ask these questions. I think it is a little strange that this resolution was not brought up Monday when we had a majority of the members present. That was only 3 days ago.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that it was the intention of Senator NEELY, of West Virginia, to take care of this matter prior to the election. The Senator happened, however, to be a candidate for Governor of his State and was called home, and the matter was overlooked. There has just been a meeting of the committee with the committee that was appointed to handle the inaugural ceremonies by the President. After a thorough discussion of the matter the committee concluded that it was absolutely essential to increase the number of seats to make it conform to the number at the previous inaugurations.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is not the point. The point is why it was not brought up last Monday or why it could not wait until next Monday.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know. The resolution just came over to the House a few moments ago. It was passed by the Senate this morning.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In response to that I should like to ask some questions about this appropriation. Does the gentleman know what the expenditure is going to be for seating?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I do not know what the expenditure will be for the entire seating, but I do know that more money will have to be provided in order to furnish the same number of seats that was furnished at previous inaugurations. As I said a moment ago, the committee has been required to reduce the number of seats even for the members of the press, and when I say the press, I mean only those entitled to entrance to the House Press Gallery and the Senate Press Gallery.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I understand that about \$68,000 represents the estimated expenditure for seating. Am I correct in my understanding? Does the gentleman know what it will cost?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know exactly what it will cost but the appropriation so far has been \$35,000, and with the additional \$7,000 will be \$42,000.

Remember a large amount is contributed by the people of the District of Columbia for general expenses, including seats along the line of march. There is always a deficit and it is the people of the District who absorb the deficit. There is a difference between the two. Congress controls the inauguration at the Capital and always has while the private inaugural committee take care of the rest.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Can the gentleman tell us what the total expenses of the inaugural are going to be?

Mr. COCHRAN. As far as the Congress is concerned, it is limited to the amount appropriated by the gentleman's committee, plus this amount. All other expenses are paid by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. There are a lot of new activities that are new and different from what we have had before. For instance, Mr. Davies has designated a Miss Dorothy Thompson to sell the inaugural to the whole country, which is something new. Can the gentleman tell us what has been set aside as an expenditure to sell the inaugural to the whole country?

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that I have never had the pleasure of meeting this distinguished columnist Miss Dorothy Thompson. I do not know what her idea is, or Mr. Davies' idea, but the Congress is not providing any money for this purpose nor does it always follow the ideas of columnists.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The chairman of the committee has designated her for a distinct function and I was wondering if they had set aside a certain amount of money for her.

Mr. COCHRAN. If they set any money aside for Miss Thompson it would come out of the money that the business people of the District of Columbia provide and not the money appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am sure it is the attitude of the Appropriations Committee that an adequate sum shall be allowed to do the job, but this inaugural should not be a gaudy affair.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, that is correct. I am sure the gentleman correctly states the attitude of his great committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objected a minute ago.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not now objecting.

Mr. MICHENER. Has the gentleman talked with him?

Mr. COCHRAN. I have talked with him.

Mr. MICHENER. He objected very vociferously a minute ago.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PAN AMERICAN COTTON CONGRESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 302 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 302

*Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper to invite all foreign countries and nations to the Pan American Cotton Congress to be held at Memphis, Tenn., during the year 1941, with a request that they participate therein.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I stated to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], a minute ago that this was a minor matter and that I would not object, but it seems to me when the resolution is read it is a very important matter. In the first place, there has never been a resolution of this kind pass the Congress since I have been here that has not been followed by a request for an appropriation somewhere along the line. If we are going to invite the Pan American countries here to a celebration, we must properly receive them, we must make arrangements for them, and this cannot be done without expense.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that I have the assurance of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Senator MCKELLAR], who lives in Memphis, and others interested, that there is no expense involved to this Government. The local people are making all the arrangements. This is simply an invitation to the countries to participate with no expense involved to the Government.

Mr. MICHENER. I respect what the gentleman says, but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has been here about as long as I have. We can remember that every world's fair and every celebration of any kind, name, or nature, where this country by proclamation has asked foreign countries to participate, has caused at a later date an appropriation to be made out of the Treasury of the United States. If the gentleman from Tennessee can name a single instance where that has not occurred, then I will hesitate to object to this matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I say that I have the assurance of the senior Senator from Tennessee that no request for an appropriation will be made, so far as he is concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but in the case of the New York World's Fair, New York Members gave their personal assurance; in the case of the World's Fair at Chicago the Members from Chicago gave us their personal assurance; and in the case of the World's Fair at Philadelphia the Members from Philadelphia gave us their assurance there would be no request for appropriations. But somebody else later on comes along and says, "We have invited all of these foreign countries. We have to treat them courteously, we have to remember that we are Americans, and we must in this case extend the hospitality for which the Old South is noted," and there will be an appropriation. In view of that I shall object for the present.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made previously in the House and include certain brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the bill which I have introduced, and also a table showing the number of Representatives each State now has and the number that will be allotted to each State if the bill becomes law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we are to retain democracy in this world it means that we are to perpetuate representative government. Democracy, as the English-speaking world knows it, is representative government.

It was built up first by the Whigs in England, and then perpetuated by all political parties in the United States that have yet come into power. It is very essential that the House of Representatives pass its own reapportionment laws and that those Representatives be apportioned as equitably as possible among the people of the various States, if our democracy is to endure.

As ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Census, I have today introduced a bill for the reapportionment of Congress, with a slight increase in the membership of the House.

It would increase the number of seats in the House of Representatives from 435 to 450, beginning with the Seventy-eight Congress which is to be elected in November 1942.

By an increase of but 15 seats in the House, and the use of the method of equal proportions, only two States, Oklahoma and Kansas, would lose a Representative. California would get 3 new Members in the House, and one new Member would be given to Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. The present number of seats would be retained by all the other States. Arkansas, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, and Ohio would not lose a Representative, as they would under an apportionment of only 435 Members by the method of major fractions.

My bill provides that the method of equal proportions shall be used, because this method, which has been developed since the method of major fractions in 1910, is recognized by scientific bodies as superior to other methods of apportionment, including the method of major fractions. In 1921 the Census Advisory Committee reported as follows:

The method of equal proportions, consistent as it is with the literal meaning of the words of the Constitution, is logically superior to the method of major fractions.

A report by the National Academy of Sciences prepared at the request of Speaker Longworth in 1929 concludes as follows:

The method of equal proportions is preferred by the committee because it satisfies the test (of proportionality) when applied either to the sizes of congressional districts or to numbers of Representatives per person, and because it occupies mathematically a neutral position with respect to emphasis on larger and smaller States.

The method of equal proportions equalizes as far as possible the congressional districts belonging to the several States, and also the individual shares belonging to the several States—that is, the number of Representatives per million people—inequalities being measured on the basis of relative differences. In fact, the method of equal proportions may be defined as the only method which will apportion a given number of Representatives among the several States, so that the ratios of population to Representatives, and also the ratios of Representatives to population, shall be as equal as may be among the several States. See Senate Document No. 304, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, especially chapter 1.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill are intended to restore the statutory provisions for the election by States of Representatives at Large in the absence of adequate State legislation for this purpose. The passage of the automatic reapportionment provision in the Fifteenth Census Act, approved June 18, 1929, was held to repeal the Reapportionment Act of August 8, 1911, which, like previous apportionment acts, had made

provision for the election of Representatives at Large (*Wood v Broun*, 287 U. S. 1). Some provisions for the election of Representatives at Large in the absence of State legislation on this subject is desirable, if not necessary.

These sections do not contain the questionable features of prior reapportionment acts requiring that Members of the House be elected from districts, and setting up unenforceable requirements as to compactness, contiguity, and equality in population in the districts.

The following table is self-explanatory; it shows the present number of Representatives from each State and the number each State will have if this bill becomes a law:

	Present number of Representatives	Proposed number of Representatives	Changes	
			Gains	Losses
United States.....	435	450	17	2
Alabama.....	9	10	1	
Arizona.....	1	2	1	
Arkansas.....	7	7		
California.....	20	23	3	
Colorado.....	4	4		
Connecticut.....	6	6		
Delaware.....	1	1		
Florida.....	5	6	1	
Georgia.....	10	11	1	
Idaho.....	2	2		
Illinois.....	27	27		
Indiana.....	12	12		
Iowa.....	9	9		
Kansas.....	7	6		1
Kentucky.....	9	10	1	
Louisiana.....	8	8		
Maine.....	3	3		
Maryland.....	6	6		
Massachusetts.....	15	15		
Michigan.....	17	18	1	
Minnesota.....	9	10	1	
Mississippi.....	7	7		
Missouri.....	13	13		
Montana.....	2	2		
Nebraska.....	5	5		
Nevada.....	1	1		
New Hampshire.....	2	2		
New Jersey.....	14	14		
New Mexico.....	1	2	1	
New York.....	45	46	1	
North Carolina.....	11	12	1	
North Dakota.....	2	2		
Ohio.....	24	24		
Oklahoma.....	9	8		1
Oregon.....	3	4	1	
Pennsylvania.....	34	34		
Rhode Island.....	2	2		
South Carolina.....	6	6		
South Dakota.....	2	2		
Tennessee.....	9	10	1	
Texas.....	21	22	1	
Utah.....	2	2		
Vermont.....	1	1		
Virginia.....	9	9		
Washington.....	6	6		
West Virginia.....	6	6		
Wisconsin.....	10	11	1	
Wyoming.....	1	1		

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. As I recall, I had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman on the last Census Committee that put out the 1929 Census bill.

Mr. RANKIN. A great share of that pleasure was mine, I assure the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It was mutual, I am sure.

Is the gentleman contending that the present law does not provide for the election of Representatives at Large or is he reading the statement as an opinion?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I contend the present law does not provide for the election of Representatives at Large.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Did not many of the States after the 1929 Census Act elect Representatives at Large where the legislature had failed to act? Kentucky, Missouri, and several other States did so, as I recall.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the States had such legislation on their statute books.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The States individually?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; or else had legislation passed to provide for that very contingency.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact, the bill which was passed and became law during the present Congress was enacted solely for the purpose of taking care of a situation where the Congress itself failed to perform its constitutional duty as it did after the 1920 census. Is not that true?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why not?

Mr. RANKIN. It was simply what some people said was our constitutional duty, but even that duty will be thoroughly performed if this bill becomes a law.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. As I understand it, the matter of Representatives at Large is determined by whether a State wins or loses in representation and upon the further fact whether the State legislature in a given State acts or not.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. If a State gains and the legislature does not act, the additional members are elected at large automatically.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what this law provides.

Mr. GEARHART. And if a State loses and the State legislature refuses to enact a law, then all the Representatives of that State are elected at large and that is an automatic procedure.

Mr. RANKIN. There is some question about that, and for that reason I inserted this provision in this bill. I will say to the gentleman from California that under this bill his State would gain three additional Representatives.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman intends to ask to suspend the rules and pass a bill at this session.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope to do so, and I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill makes the following changes: If we were to fail to reapportion Congress and the automatic reapportionment went into effect the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas would each lose a Member. The States of North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Michigan, New Mexico, Arizona, and Oregon would gain a Member, and the State of California would gain three. The other States would retain their present representations.

Under this bill Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, and Arkansas would all retain their present representations. Therefore it would not be necessary to tear up the Representatives from those States.

The States of Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin, would gain one Member each, and the State of California would gain three. The only two States left that would lose would be Oklahoma and Kansas—States that have lost population as a result of being in the Dust Bowl. The House would have to be raised to 477 before that could be prevented; 476 for Kansas and 477 to take care of Oklahoma.

Mr. GEARHART. If you increase the membership to 450 in order to prevent all States except 2 from losing, why not raise it to a figure which would prevent any State from losing?

Mr. RANKIN. That question is as old as the Government and has been asked every time a measure has come before the Congress to reapportion the membership of the House. This is the smallest number—450—that will take care of all the States except these 2 that have lost population as a result of the Dust Bowl. I wish it were different. I should like to see every State retain its present membership and take care of the increase, and my opinion is that this figure of 450 will probably be the stabilizing point of the membership of this House and that in future years the population will become more stable and there will be very little change in the representation from the various States.

Let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] that this proposition does not affect me personally. My State is not involved. Mississippi will not lose or gain if the



membership remains at 435 or if we reapportion under this bill providing for 450.

Mr. GEARHART. If we reapportioned at 477, no States would lose.

Mr. RANKIN. That is true; several additional States would gain and I think probably my State would be one of them.

Mr. GEARHART. California would gain also.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably so, but I think California should be satisfied with a gain of three additional Members.

Mr. GEARHART. I think so, but we are thinking about our brothers in other States.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish it were possible to work out such a proposition. Of course, the membership of the House has the right to pass whatever legislation it pleases.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, the speech the gentleman has made is one that was made in 1920 when he was here—not by him, but by all of us—and the one that was made in 1930. The fundamental thing is, Shall we increase the number of Members of Congress for the purpose of protecting the seats of certain Members now serving here? I said in 1920 and I said in 1930 and I repeat it now, and I think there are many others here who will vote to reduce the membership of the House to 300, because the work of the House is largely done by that number of men, and the weight of the vote of each State under the constitutional apportionment is exactly the same to the State, whether you have 300 or whether you have 3,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Now I will answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. In the first place, the gentleman is entirely wrong. The more you contract the membership of the House, the further you get away from representative government, the further you get from the people. When the Congress was first provided for by the wisest group of men whoever sat under one roof—the framers of the Constitution—they provided that no Member should represent less than 30,000 people. Today, under the last census, we represented 280,000 on the average. Under this bill the average would be 294,000, almost 10 times the number the fathers of the Constitution had in mind when they were bringing about on this continent representative government, which means democracy for America.

Another thing, when I came to the House of Representatives it is true the Republicans were in power. You had just had that glamorous inauguration of President Harding that I was going to speak about a moment ago. I believe it was about the most spectacular performance of its kind I ever saw. The Republicans were in power. I got very little mail from my district, but since that time the business of Congress has grown, the political intelligence of the Nation seems to have increased, and the business of the average Member has doubled many times. The people he represents have more matters, more propositions to take up with him, matters that he must give his individual attention if he is going to properly represent them. I do not see how a Member of Congress can properly represent more than 294,000, which would be the average for each district under this bill.

Now, we have the smallest legislative body in the world for any great country that has a legislature at all. The House is not crowded. We have ample room for the seating of 15 additional Members. We have ample office space. One floor of the New House Office Building has not been completed, I understand. There are a large number of offices in the old House Office Building. A new Member would not mind going to the fifth floor, I suppose. I stayed there for years and enjoyed it. But what I am trying to do now is to bring about a reapportionment of Congress that will come as near doing justice to all States as possible and at the same time hold the House down to a reasonable number of Representatives. I believe this bill will do that very thing.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman has already answered the question I intended to ask, which was concerning the space in the office buildings.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; we have ample space.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I have been very much interested in what the gentleman has said on this reapportionment proposition. In conversation with my colleagues I find that under the gentleman's proposition there is only one State that will actually be disturbed, and that is the State of Kansas. In Oklahoma they have a Congressman at Large. So they will just do away with him, and there is really only one State involved in this matter, and that is the State of Kansas.

Mr. RANKIN. There is only one State that would have to be redistricted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I heartily agree with what the gentleman said about not making congressional districts include more people. I believe at present it is possible for a Member who tries his best to do it, to maintain very close relationship with a considerable number of people in his district. That means that he can be independent to a large extent in his relationship with those people. If the district were much larger it could not be done. I think, with the gentleman, that that is a very important element in democratic government.

Mr. RANKIN. Now let me say to the membership of the House, in conclusion, that you are the only ones on the Federal pay roll who cannot get there except by a vote of the people in your districts. A man may go from the Vice-Presidency to the Presidency. He may go from the Cabinet to the Presidency. A Senator may be appointed by the Governor of his State; all other Federal employees are appointed; but there is only one way a person can get in this House, and that is by a vote of a majority of the people of his district who go to the polls and express their suffrage in his favor.

That is representative government; that is democracy as the English-speaking nations of the world know it. It is the only kind of democracy that can survive.

If we would maintain democracy in America we must maintain a representative government, and the closer that representation stays to the people back at home the more representative it is going to be and the longer our institutions will live.

You can pile up bureaucracy all you want to; you can increase expenditures; you can delegate your authority; but if you are going to keep alive that democracy for which the world is pleading, and to which civilization is now looking, it is going to be done only by maintaining representative government, keeping it close to the people, and having those representatives exercise the prerogatives vested in them by the Constitution of the United States and by the people who send them here. For these reasons I prefer to see the House pass a measure of this kind and reapportion its own membership.

So far as increasing the House membership from 435 to 450, a slight difference of 15 Members, I say it is amply justified under the circumstances. I trust the committee will report the measure out and that we can get it passed at an early date.

There are some legislatures that meet within the next few days, around the 1st of January. Some of them have a 60-day limit, so I am told. I do not know when they will meet again. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are going to pass any legislation to take care of this situation we ought to do it as quickly as possible. [Applause.]

For the benefit of the Members I am inserting a copy of the bill at this point. It reads as follows:

A bill to provide for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Sixteenth Census

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the Seventy-eighth and subsequent Congresses the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, which shall be apportioned by the method of equal proportions among the several States according to the population thereof as determined by the sixteenth decennial census.

Sec. 2. In case of an increase in the number of Representatives in any State under any apportionment, such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected by the State at large and the other Representatives by the districts then prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted in the manner provided by

the laws thereof; if there be no change in the number of Representatives from a State, the Representatives thereof shall be elected from the districts then prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted in the manner provided by the laws thereof; and if there be a decrease in the number of Representatives from a State, the Representatives thereof shall be elected by the State at large until such State shall be redistricted in the manner provided by the laws thereof.

Sec. 3. The candidates for Representative or Representatives to be elected at large in any State shall be nominated in the same manner as candidates for Governor, unless otherwise provided by the laws of such State.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by Mr. Stanley A. Bevin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from a Washington newspaper entitled "Alter Ego to the F. B. I."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] at Fairfax Court-house, Va., on July 1, 1940, at the unveiling of a tablet containing the names of the Confederate soldiers from Fairfax County, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized.

#### CRIMINAL ALIENS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, December 2, I spoke before the House on subversive activities. In this speech I had some things to say about Mme. Perkins, the Secretary of Labor, and the Attorney General, particularly with reference to the lack of action on deporting undesirable aliens, such as Harry Bridges and some 800 others, and particularly about the cancelation of the citizenship papers of one Fritz Kuhn.

I note in the RECORD, on page 13825, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has some comments on my speech. I will take these in the order of their sequence. He said that I had failed to advise the House that these matters had been investigated by the Attorney General and Department of Justice and that the Department of Justice had rendered a report to the Attorney General, who, he was sure, was giving the matter "careful study and consideration." If the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] had paid attention to my speech he would have found therein where I said that we have been given the same answers as he gives here, namely, that "careful study and consideration" was being given the matter. That was the substance of my criticism of both the Attorney General and Mme. Perkins. That was as far as any of these things have ever got—that we were always advised that "careful study and consideration" was being given these matters, but we never have been advised of any prosecutions nor convictions of these criminals. That is the reason that I demanded action from the Attorney General other than verbal action, the only thing we have ever had.

With further reference to this same comment—and I think it was a matter of common knowledge; certainly every Congressman should be cognizant of the things going on in Government—that the F. B. I. has made this report and the Attorney General says it will have to be "studied carefully" for 2 months. This is good conversation, but I submit to you, What can these subversive interests do to our national-defense program in 2 months? We have the heads of our defense program now drawing our attention to lost time, and

an editorial, which was a very good one, in the Washington Post says that our "yesterdays" can never be recovered. I think this is a true statement, and I think also that the destruction these subversive interests are now carrying on can never be repaired.

With further reference to the fact that this is under investigation, I will call my distinguished colleague's attention to the fact that I have talked on this for practically 2 years, as every Member of the House knows, and during those 2 years there has been nothing but investigation. I ask my distinguished colleague if he knows that Harry Bridges was never tried before any duly appointed and qualified Federal judge, or any other elected judge, but that he did have a hearing before Dean Landis, who is not a judge and does not bear the title of judge, and that, in my opinion, the department that handled this matter was actually afraid to have it come before the Federal judge in San Francisco on account of this judge's record of having deported aliens under similar conditions, and that they did not want Bridges deported. It is my further opinion that the Department went to great lengths to place this case in a jurisdiction where they knew that Harry Bridges would be defended and not prosecuted; that this hearing before Landis was nothing more than a farce and a whitewash; and I call his attention to the Landis report and the practical confession that Harry Bridges made therein.

I also draw my distinguished colleague's attention to the fact that there is always a certain group who are coming to the aid and assistance of these subversive interests, who are always giving us these words, "Careful study and consideration is being given to the matter." They defend them on technicalities. They say there are other means of handling the situation and make technical objections; but after they have stopped the deportations of the criminals and subversive interests, they never come forward and follow through to see that they are deported. I ask my distinguished colleague from New York if he is now coming to the defense of Fritz Kuhn. If he heard my speech, he certainly knows that I stated that the Department had 54 precedents for canceling Kuhn's citizenship, after which they could then proceed with his deportation. Is this gentleman against any such procedure? For this gentleman's information, I have been after this Department for several months and cannot get any action. If the gentleman will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he will see wherein I filed my letter asking the cancelation of citizenship papers of Fritz Kuhn. I ask this same gentleman why we should not criticize any official who we think is not doing his duty. I ask him if this country has become so nazified that he thinks that Congressmen are nothing but pawns and should not criticize these bureaucrats.

He says, "it is pathetic to see any Member attack any department head." My answer is that it is pathetic to think that a Congressman has any such concept of his duty as to make that statement. My idea is that Congressmen are sent to the Congress of the United States to represent their people, and when any department head, in any party, fails to do his duty it should be brought to the attention of the Congressmen, and if that failure continues I again make the statement that the official should have to resign, be discharged, or be impeached. I certainly cannot yield to any such concept as this, as it does not coincide with my idea of what constitutes American representation and the duties of a Representative.

Would this gentleman from New York have us sit silently and idly by while this subversive program of destruction is going on?

Does this gentleman from New York defend Harry Bridges, Fritz Kuhn, C. I. O., these Communists, these Nazis and Fascists, whom I am fighting? If his answer is "No," I again say that it appears to me that criticism of officials who fail to do their duty is entirely proper, and I say to him that it is pathetic to me to see any Member defend these people, directly or indirectly, or defend the officials who in turn are defending them.

With reference to Mme. Perkins, wherein he states that she has failed to do this, that, or the other, but that she did the job in the best way the law would give her the right to do, he also states that you cannot deport a criminal unless



there is a place to send him to. This is nothing more than drawing a herring across the trail. My opinion is that Mme. Perkins has been the worst failure in history of any Cabinet officer. Meeting the criticism of the gentleman from New York fairly, I will say that his answer does not hold water, because Harry Bridges could and should be deported to Australia. Secondly, Fritz Kuhn's citizenship paper can be canceled and he can be sent to Germany. My colleague must certainly know that there is still a Germany and there is still an Australia, and that he, or none of our officials, can hide behind that general statement in the face of the facts, namely, that there still is an Australia and there still is a Germany. Neither can he hide behind the fact that where these criminals—and I use the word as used by my colleague—are found to be criminals, they certainly should be confined either in prisons, immigration stations, or concentration camps. These institutions have not been wiped out by the Treaty of Versailles, and to have him make the statement that Mme. Perkins could not do anything under these conditions and the criticisms against her were unjustified, appears to me to be juvenile and worse than no statement at all.

In the last paragraph my colleague says:

The criticism of any head of a department is unfair at this time, when we are trying to work together for national defense, irrespective of political beliefs or affiliations.

This is rather an astute statement, but, reduced to plain English, I say that I agree with him that we should stand together for the protection of this country; but the thing that I am criticizing is the protection that these saboteurs and criminals are getting, whose object is to destroy our defense program, and that is exactly what these people whom the Department of Justice and Mme. Perkins have protected are trying to do. My colleague is not consistent, because it is not consistent to protect these criminals and—I use his own words—allow them to run at large, carry on their program, and then say we are defending the country.

I notice he says that "the Department has done the very thing it was supposed to do." My answer to that is this: Supposed to do by whom? By the Communists, the Nazis, the Fascisti, saboteurs, and criminals? Or is their duty to the people who have the welfare of this country at heart? By my colleague's own statement, on page 13825, he says you cannot "deport even the worst criminal unless there is a place to send him to." Are the heads of our departments, namely, Mme. Perkins and Attorney General Jackson, unaware that there are prisons and places to put criminals? Or specifically, in Bridges' and Kuhn's cases, Australia and Germany?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point for a question?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Cannot a criminal be sent to jail if he happens to be an alien?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. If he has committed a crime, yes; by a court of competent jurisdiction, and if our Attorney General wants to carry out the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Attorney General have the right to refuse to try a case because the man accused does not have a country to go to?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. His thought was that the country had been wiped out; but Australia and Germany had not been wiped out. Either one of these men could be sent back to the country from which he came.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do not our courts have jurisdiction over alien criminals to send them to State prisons or to the Federal penitentiary?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. In ordinary cases they do, but in this case this man was not tried by a court, was not tried by a judge; he was tried by a university professor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If, as the gentleman from New York said, these men are criminals, I would like to know the reason why they cannot be sent where they belong, either to State prisons or the Federal penitentiary.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. They should be sent to prison. Bridges can be held for a felony right now, perjury.

Why should a Member of Congress have to tell the Attorney General that there is a prison to which to send these people, a concentration camp, back to Australia, or back to Germany? I again criticize this official, if that is my colleague's defense of him, and say that this official should at least know that.

This whole procedure, as has been indulged in in the past, appears to me to parallel that type of procedure in some of the larger cities where the gangsters are said to have received their protection.

I again criticize Mme. Perkins and Attorney General Jackson in that they have given explanations that are as full of as many holes as my colleague's criticism is.

When I offered a general bill before the Immigration and Naturalization Committee my colleague from New York said it would be impossible of interpretation, that is, that part of the bill that said when these subversive interests gave aid to Communists, Nazis, and Fascisti, helped, aided, abetted, and so forth, that that language was impossible of interpretation. My answer to him was that the language was parallel to the language used in our criminal codes, which has successfully been used by all the courts for 150 years, namely, that the judges and juries in this country have always been able to determine what an accessory or an accomplice to murder was.

I can only say that my colleague certainly has courage to defend either Mme. Perkins or Attorney General Jackson for lack of action and nonperformance of duty in connection with the deportation of Harry Bridges and the cancelation of Fritz Kuhn's citizenship.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On Monday of this week, the last time the House was in session, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] stated in answer to a question which I asked that he had not criticized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] or his committee. Does the gentleman know anything about the accuracy of that statement?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes; I know the answer he gave.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What was the answer he gave to my question? The answer that appears in the RECORD was not the answer recorded by the stenographer. As it appeared in the RECORD it did not seem to me to be the one that was made on the floor.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. His original answer was, "No; I have not."

The corrected answer has been changed entirely, in substance to read: "Not until recently."

Mr. HOFFMAN. What was the question?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. The question was: "You say you have not opposed the Dies committee or criticized the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DIES?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what was his answer then?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. His original answer was: "No; I have not."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman looked at the RECORD to see whether that appears on the RECORD?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes; the RECORD is in accordance with the corrected statement, not the original statement.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore made I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, a privilege to speak before the House when so many of the Representatives from the great State of Pennsylvania are present as they usually are. [Applause.] They have been extremely faithful in attending the sessions of the House while so many on the majority side are absent day after day.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Is the gentleman going through all the States?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I think not. I might call attention to the fact, however, that before we recessed there was more or less hysteria about a war somewhere, about the necessity for appropriating billions of dollars for national defense and about the dangers that we were incurring by our failure to at once adopt the conscription law.

Let us consider the statements of the President and some of his supporters. Many people got the idea from their statements that we were going to be invaded at once. It was on the 20th of May last that the President, by his statements indicating that there was danger of an immediate invasion from Germany, that many of the cities of the interior might be blown to dust by German bombers, threw the whole country into hysterics.

I notice, however, that now that the election is over, and although the President for the purposes of the campaign frequently made the statement that he could not be absent from Washington, that he must remain near enough to the Nation's Capital so that he could get back within 12 hours, the danger now appears to have been dissipated by the lapse of time or, perhaps more correctly, by the success of the drive for a third term, and he now finds time, notwithstanding the war is still going on, to take about a 10-day fishing trip.

As on another occasion when he had satisfied his penchant for theatrics by shouting "fire, fire," and calling Congress in special session, at a cost of half a million dollars, he, figuratively speaking, now tucks his tongue in his cheek and goes off on a vacation. It is to be hoped on this one he will not, as he did on a prior occasion, see a mythical submarine. If his ego demands publicity, however, we shall undoubtedly get news reports over the radio that a mysterious submarine, perhaps a sister ship to that one which did not appear off Newfoundland but about which he told us, has been seen in the vicinity of the Presidential fishing cruiser.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman mentioned about certain Members being present from Pennsylvania. There are more present besides Members from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; the gentleman is always present, and the seats on the minority, the Republican, side are apparently well filled.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I may say that the Republican Members from Pennsylvania are present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I noticed that the Republican Members from Pennsylvania were present and referred to the fact.

DEMOCRACY, LIKE CHARITY, SHOULD BEGIN AT HOME

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago, at the cost of billions of dollars, untold suffering, and the death of more than 130,000 men, this Nation fought a war to make the world safe for democracy.

Again the warmongers, who seldom fight and never pay, the money changers, who squeeze their fool's gold out of the blood and the suffering of the common people, are raising the cry that, for the preservation of civilization and our own freedom, we must again join the war-mad nations of Europe in their bloody, senseless, wholesale slaughter of enslaved men, innocent women, helpless children.

It is well, it is good, to be generous; to be helpful to others. It may be expedient for us in our own interest to aid those others, upon whose success, so many would have us believe, our own freedom depends.

One thing is sure. One thing is certain. It is futile to talk, to act, to expend treasure, to waste lives, if, at the end of the road, we find this Nation either unable or unwilling to protect the liberty of its citizens.

"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" has been oftentimes repeated. What have we gained by fighting to protect the democracies of the world, the freedom of the common man of Europe, if,

when the day of battle has ended, when the sun has gone down into a sea of blood, when its light no longer makes visible the graves of the millions of men who have died in vain, our own citizens are deprived of the freedom which for so long has been theirs?

When, because of his sins, God drove Adam from the Garden of Eden, He said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." From that day to this, man, if he would live, has been forced to work. The right to work is a God-given right. The right to work is a right guaranteed by our Constitution. The right to work is a necessity to man's existence.

Yet here in so-called free America today, men—thousands of them—are denied the right to earn a livelihood for themselves, for their families; to provide for their old age, to render their future secure.

This Government of ours exists only because it can levy taxes upon its citizens. It can levy taxes only when its citizens are profitably employed. Denied the right to work, men cannot pay taxes for the support of their government. How foolish the government which denies protection to the man who earns the wage out of which comes the tax which enables that government to exist. How stupid the government which permits another to share its power to tax. How utterly devoid of political morality is the government which joins hands in partnership with those who by might, without semblance of right, prey upon the man who must earn his daily bread by his toil.

Never, no, never in all history, has a greater shame come to any nation than that which is with us today because of our cowardice, our failure to deal with this situation. The fate of a nation whose boast it is that it is the richest, the greatest, the most powerful Nation in all the world; which loudly proclaims that it is the last outpost of civilization; from whose Statue of Liberty there flames the torch of liberty, rests in the hands of those who are either so thoughtless, so ignorant, or so cowardly that they will not protect the right of the man who but desires to earn the food which sustains life, the clothing which keeps him from freezing, the shelter which protects him from the elements.

The right to work is an absolute right. It is not a qualified right. No man, no organization, no municipality, no government has the right to deny to man the means of sustaining himself—the right to exist.

That this Government of ours is doing that very thing—that is, permitting the levying of tribute, the qualifying of a man's right to keep body and soul together—is shown by the communications which have been placed by me in the RECORD. It is shown by excerpts of a letter attached hereto, and this letter is but one of many.

For almost a year this Congress has been in session. For an equal length of time we have known that democracy no longer prevails in these United States of America. We have known that an essential, constitutional, moral right has been, and is being, denied to thousands of our citizens. For more than a month we have known that the cost of our whole program of national defense has been and now is being increased; that its scope has been and is being limited.

Is it because we fear the voting power of organized minorities that we refuse to take action, to give relief? The most damning thing that can be said against democracy is that when it sees its very existence threatened by unlawful activities—when it knows that its citizens are being deprived of the rights given them under their form of government and which they must have the privilege of exercising, unhampered and untrammelled, if they and the Nation are to endure—it neglects or refuses to take adequate measures for its own protection.

Preserve the democracies of the Old World is the cry. My plea to you is preserve democracy here in America by restoring to the individual the opportunity to work, to labor for the defense of his country, which has so long been denied him.

Aid to preserve the democracies of Europe; yes. But first the restoration of democracy here at home.



To those who insist that we fight the dictators abroad, restore democracy to the people of the Old World, let me quote the words of Saint Matthew, who wrote:

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Or how wilt thou say to thy brother: Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

As a preliminary to casting out the dictators of Europe, restoring democracy to the people of Europe, let us here in Congress cast out the dictators, the collectors of tribute, and restore to the American workingman his right to work.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to make this observation in connection with the measure which the gentleman from Michigan has introduced and his speech of the present moment. Yesterday there came to my office a man who has been given a job at Fort Belvoir in a carpenter position in the construction program.

When he went to report for that job he found he could not go to work, even though the Government had a job for him and he had been called, if he was not a member of the carpenters' union. He had a conference with the union here and was told that he would have to pay \$75 to work, but that the union officials would accept one-half of that \$75, and after he had received his first month's pay the second installment of \$37.50 could be paid.

I was told by this man that he had been without employment and that he did not have the money necessary to pay the union. There were tears in his eyes—he was confronted with a very real problem.

I have fought for labor legislation and know organized labor has done much to right many wrongs for those who toil. We do stop and wonder, however, as we meet situations such as the one I have described.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is to obtain relief from situations similar to that which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has just mentioned that I dropped in the hopper today a bill which extends to the national-defense program the provisions of sections 276 (b) and (c), title 40, Code in force January 3, 1935, which were enacted to prevent a kick-back or a reduction of Federal wages on Government work, and which bill would add a new provision, making it unlawful to demand or receive any sum of money as a condition precedent to obtaining work or furnishing materials, or continuing to work or furnish materials, in connection with the national-defense program. This bill seeks to end the racketeering now prevalent on so many Government jobs.

Let me read excerpts from a letter which throw more light on what is happening at Fort Belvoir—within 25 miles of where Congress is in session. Let me quote excerpts from a letter received Tuesday, December 3:

This letter is signed, and the gentleman who sent it to me enclosed his social-security card. He enclosed three work permits, one given him, one for which he paid \$5, both of these from a Washington union; a third one, for which he paid \$5, purporting to be issued by a union at 25 School Street, Quincy, Mass., but which, as a matter of fact, was obtained at Quantico.

The writer of this letter suggested that I should not use his name, although he did state that I might do so if it would be helpful. He writes:

EAST FALLS CHURCH, VA.,  
December 2, 1940.

HONORABLE SIR: The following statements and enclosures are absolutely true and correct in every detail, dealing with the national-defense project at Fort Belvoir, Va.

On Monday \* \* \* I went to Fort Belvoir, Va., seeking work as a laborer. I was asked by the superintendent if I had a union card. I told him no; he advised me I would have to join the union in Washington, D. C., before he could put me to work.

It being late in the afternoon, I went to the laborers' union hall, 523 New Jersey Avenue NW., the next morning. \* \* \* There was a colored man in the office. I told him I would like to have a

permit to work at Fort Belvoir, Va. He told me a union card would cost me \$58—\$25 down and the balance of \$33 to be paid within 60 days. This included 3 months' dues. I told him I did not have \$25. He told me that was the union rules.

On Monday \* \* \* I went to Fort Belvoir again with a man by name of \* \* \*, a neighbor of mine, but we soon learned we had to pay \$25 down for a card before we could go to work. \* \* \* has a family and was in the same predicament as myself.

On Tuesday \* \* \* I heard they were giving permits to laborers for \$10. I borrowed \$10 and went to Fort Belvoir on Wednesday. I stood in line at office in the rain about an hour. When my turn came I was told that I would have to get a work permit from the union before they could sign me up, but the young man told me that the union representative was out front in his car. I at once went to him with \$10. He told me he could not take any money from me but would give me a permit if I would go to the union in Washington, D. C., by \* \* \* and pay \$5. I agreed to do this, and he gave me permit signed \* \* \*, good until November 17, 1940. I went to the job on November 14, 1940. However, it was raining, and the superintendent told me to come back and start to work on Monday, November 18, 1940. This I did. So did my neighbor \* \* \*, and we have been working at Fort Belvoir since then.

On Tuesday \* \* \* one of the men I was working with asked me where I had gotten my card. I told him I had paid \$5 for permit in Washington, D. C. He then told me there was a laborers' union at Quantico, Va., and that I could get a card for \$12, \$5 down and balance of \$7 in 30 days.

On \* \* \* I found a laborer who lived at Quantico, Va. I gave him my Social Security card and \$5, and asked him to get me a permit, and on \* \* \* he brought me this permit issued by Robert Bates, good for 30 days, and issued by Local Union 801, Quantico, Va.

However, when my neighbor \* \* \* went to Quantico to get a permit, Robert Bates, a colored man, advised him the initiation fee had been raised to \$23, 2 weeks ago.

No one will ever know what my family and myself have gone through these past 4½ years, but, sir, they have been more bitter than all of my past 55 years. And for my family's sake, I am asking that you protect my name if possible.

My work number at Fort Belvoir is \* \* \*. I am working on section \* \* \* and can furnish the names of any number of reputable men who are working on this same job, who have paid \$5, \$10, \$15, and \$25 for permits to work on this job and paid it in advance.

The Local Union, 801, in Quantico, Va., was chartered 6 or 7 months ago. At first, the initiation fee was \$5. I have been told there are about 150 laborers working at Fort Belvoir from this Local 801 in Quantico.

There is also a laborers' union of the same type in Alexandria, Va., Local Union No. 1079. But for some untold reason the big shots from Washington, D. C., moved in on this job.

Will you kindly have these enclosures returned to me by last of this week. I have to show this permit to steward each Monday.

It's grand to be an American citizen, but, sir, it's hell to have to pay tribute to racketeers and crooks as a condition to work.

If I can help you in any way, though it may cost me my life in this fight, I'll be glad to help. You will note that I lost about 3 weeks' work before I went to work on this job, and should this complaint become known, I am sure I will be done for.

The profit in labor is too great and the choice whether to pay or not to pay should rest with the worker, not the labor faker. If you keep up the fight, you are sure to make this a decent place to work in.

Phoned in yesterday morning December 4—by a man who gave his name, who said that he was 63 years old; that he held a union card and had handled labor for many years—was the following information: He said that the contractors at Indian Head were Harwood & Nebbel, who had an office in the fifteen or sixteen hundred block on K Street NW.; that these contractors were putting up houses; that they were not employing carpenters' helpers for the reason that if they did the helpers would be forced to join a union.

He stated that instead of employing carpenters' helpers they were employing common labor at 80 cents per hour on a 40-hour week with overtime at time and a half.

He further stated that if one of these laborers aided in taking lumber from a truck he must at once join a union.

He further stated that a union representative on the ground whenever a truck drove in, at once inquired as to whether the driver was a union man; and if he was not, demanded that he join a union.

The same gentleman gave me further information, which was in substance that a young college graduate who had never had a day's experience as a carpenter was working on a Government job now as carpenter, within a few miles of Washington; that he earned or was paid \$120 a week, the wage

rate being \$10 per day, but the young man getting in enough time and a half and double time to run the weekly wage to \$120.

The gentleman phoning in the information said that he knew what he was talking about as he had relatives on Government work and he was himself a Government employee and a union man. He declined to permit me to use his name, stating that the reason was obvious—that he did not want trouble with union men.

Statements like the foregoing, whether they be true or false, create discontent and unrest, and the House should appoint a committee as I asked it to some days ago, to ascertain the facts as to the many very serious charges which have been made and many of which are not denied.

I am today introducing privileged resolutions in an effort to secure some of this information. Previously I have introduced resolutions seeking similar information, but the information, for some reason or another, has not been given. It is quite evident that the only effective way to uncover and put an end to this racketeering is through an investigating committee of the House.

Whether the Department of Justice is too busy to investigate this condition, whether it has investigated it, or whether it lacks authority to stop this sort of racketeering through prosecuting for conspiracy is all beside the point. The racketeering exists, extortion is being practiced upon the workingman. The cost of the defense program is being unjustly enhanced, the defense program is being delayed.

Sooner or later, unlawful interference with our national-defense program, with the right of a man to work, must be brought to an end. We might just as well do it now as to let it continue.

December 3, a retired major who stated his business was causing him to visit various camps, giving his name and rank, phoned the following information:

He said that at Camp Dix, 14 miles out of Trenton, N. J., the fee that must be paid by carpenters before they can work at the camp is \$100; that the wage is \$21 a day; that that was not the prevailing wage in that locality; and that when he asked as to why that wage was paid he was advised it was the wage in New York City, from which the carpenters came.

Another man, a resident of Washington, who gave his name and who is listed in the telephone directory but who did not wish to be quoted directly, said that he was studying carpentry in connection with the defense program in one of the Washington high schools.

He then said, "You were correct in your statement yesterday about the necessity of paying in order to get a job at Fort Belvoir. They are using 2,000 carpenters, and each one is required to pay \$50—\$25 down and the rest at the end of 3 days." He then asked, "Is that not a rake-off of \$100,000?"

He further said that nearly 200 carpenters were fired because they were incompetent but that they did not get back the \$25 fee paid.

One of the purposes for the introduction of the resolution for an appointment of a committee to investigate is to determine the accuracy of such statements as the foregoing. Some of these statements we know to be true; as to others, there is a dispute. The taxpayers are entitled to know the truth.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill S. 3729, which the House considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### WAGES IN THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the entire aircraft industry is being threatened at the present moment with an outbreak of strikes, which promise to bring the whole aviation defense program to a standstill. The production of planes, so vital to this Nation as well as to Great Britain, is in danger of being stopped at any moment. The demands now being made for

wage increases are not an outgrowth of the Vultee strike, since in many cases the demand for increases was made at about the same time at many aircraft plants. However, the demands have been altered to conform with the Vultee scale of wages, being reduced from the 75-cent minimum originally asked to 62½ cents.

The ink was not dry on the Vultee agreement before it was announced that higher wages would be sought from Ryan Aeronautical Co. at San Diego, North American Aviation, Menasco Manufacturing Co., and the Harvill Aircraft Die Casting Corporation of Los Angeles. Nor are the demands confined to the west coast, since the New York Times of yesterday reports that wage demands and organization efforts are being made at Farmingdale, Long Island, where the Ranger Aircraft Engineering Co., Republic Aviation Corporation, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, and Liberty Aircraft Corporation are the primary objects of the eastern attack. Workers at the Ranger Aircraft plant voted last month to go on strike, but so far have not done so.

The pretext for these increased wage demands is based upon the difference between the hourly wage rates paid in the automobile industry and the rates paid in the aircraft industry. The average hourly wage scale in the automobile industry is 94.9 cents as of July 1940. That of the aircraft industry for July is 73.8 cents. However, the aircraft industry provides steady annual employment for 52 weeks in the year, while that of the automobile industry is seasonal. In 1938 the average annual earnings of the automobile worker were only \$1,184; and in 1939 were \$1,440; whereas the annual average earnings for the aircraft worker, even at 73.8 cents an hour, will be \$1,584. In the aircraft industry at the present time nearly half of the employees have been working for less than a year, whereas more than half of the automobile employees have worked for more than 5 years in the industry. Aircraft employees after their first year of work receive substantial increases of pay, so that for the older workers the average annual pay exceeds \$2,000. The present annual wage of the aircraft industry now far exceeds the average of the automobile worker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman care to insert here the average wage of the agricultural worker, which is less than \$500 a year?

Mr. COSTELLO. I might state to the gentleman that if we go into the nonmanufacturing field we will find it is very much lower than either the automobile or aircraft industry, and likewise the average wage for all manufacturing industries is considerably lower than either of the two I have mentioned.

It is a significant fact that where wages are increased the number of hours worked are usually reduced, so that the annual income of the worker is less than under the lower wage. The automobile industry is a mass-production industry, demanding less of the precision and technique of the aircraft industry. With assembly lines and conveyor belts, quantity is produced in the automobile industry, while the skill of the individual workman is required in the aircraft, so that the two cannot rightly be compared.

Mr. Speaker, the Vultee strike is ended, but the price of the settlement has not been mentioned. The labor cost in aircraft manufacturing is 40 percent of the cost of the finished product. If the Vultee standard of wages is to be forced upon the industry, then the added cost of airplane production will be \$250,000,000. This cost is going to be passed on to the Government in the purchase price of the planes now under construction. In a word, the taxpayer will be charged an additional \$250,000,000 without receiving the benefit of even one additional plane.

The Vultee scale of wages cannot be forced upon every aircraft manufacturer in the country without completely disrupting the whole economy of many communities in which the plants are located. The Vultee scale of wages cannot be adopted in the aircraft industry without causing a similar increase in wages in all industries throughout the Nation. These increases are the first step in a period of inflation which



threatens to make the silk-shirt days of the World War period look like shreds of cotton. Something must be done to prevent this wild inflationary movement which is now budding. It is up to the Federal Government itself to determine whether it is willing to pay the added cost made necessary by reason of these wage increases. The Government must decide now what policy it will pursue before the movement shall go too far.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend an editorial which appears in this morning's Washington Post, calling upon the Government to appoint some single head as a coordinator of the entire defense program because without such a head no real action can be had.

The Government must decide now whether the taxpayer is going to be called upon to pay the piper \$250,000,000 but receive not one additional airplane.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope the gentleman will agree with me that there has not been a period in our history, at least certainly not in recent years, when there was greater need for the Congress of the United States to be in session and to have been in session, with its committees functioning and with its Members giving attention to these problems, than at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. COSTELLO. I think the gentleman is quite correct in that respect. If legislation is required to solve this particular problem, the gentleman knows full well it is a very difficult thing to try to write legislation that will really cover the situation, and unless the committees are functioning, no consideration can be given to this matter until next January, and by that time it may be far too late to attempt to remedy the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about the editorial in this morning's Post calling for a coordinator.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that something like 2 weeks ago I dropped a bill in the hopper calling for the appointment of representatives from departments of the Government to ascertain and fix, or rather stabilize where they now are, prices of services and commodities during the period that this emergency may exist; that is, while we are preparing for war, the purpose being not to cut down wages, but to keep everything on an even keel; the cost of living to be kept down and wages to stay where they are and everything to stay right where it is now, so that neither the Wall Street fellow nor the banker nor the labor racketeer can profit.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, has for several years attempted to enact legislation of that character. Numerous hearings have been held on trying to prevent profits from being created in wartimes, and likewise to stabilize prices at the very outbreak of such an emergency as the country is now facing, and I believe something along that line must be done if we are to avoid this period of inflation which is definitely headed our way. Frankly, it does the laborer no good to increase his wages to an exorbitant figure if the prices of all commodities are going to be increased in like manner or in excess of the wage increase. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I propose to discuss a subject here which, to me, is not at all pleasant, which Members from the cotton section of the United States do not dare discuss in the manner in which I am going to present it, but as a Member of this House and as a Representative of the Eighth District of Michigan, with my constituents holding an interest in 6,300,000 bales of cotton, I feel that it is time for some very plain statements to be made. Some things have

occurred in the city of Washington in the last few days which have to do with this great basic crop which we call cotton.

In my opinion, there is rank collusion among certain warehouse operators who store cotton belonging to the United States, and also cotton in which the cotton growers of this country have an equity under commodity-credit loans.

Furthermore, I am convinced that these cotton-warehouse operators have been in Washington for the specific purpose of influencing Members of the Congress of the United States, not only to circumvent the law, but to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out its responsibilities to the taxpayers of the United States.

On October 31, the commodity-inventory sheet of the Commodity Credit Corporation shows commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to include 6,347,787 bales of cotton. The last cotton-information sheet which I am able to obtain from the Department of Agriculture, dated December 4, 1940, shows that 2,239,979 bales of the crop of 1940-41 of cotton have moved into Commodity Credit Corporation loans, as completed and reported to the corporation by States, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this sheet in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION REPORTS ON 1940 COTTON LOANS

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 4, 1940.

Commodity Credit Corporation announced today that through December 2, 1940, loans made on 1940-crop cotton by the Corporation and lending agencies aggregate \$107,967,056.98 on 2,239,979 bales.

Cotton loans completed and reported to the Corporation by States are as follows:

State	Number of bales	Amount
Alabama.....	86,861	\$4,167,764.59
Arizona.....	26,702	1,286,022.98
Arkansas.....	82,121	3,911,556.37
California.....	74,459	3,779,813.48
Florida.....	151	7,320.73
Georgia.....	141,167	6,771,864.47
Louisiana.....	80,504	3,898,484.50
Mississippi.....	58,316	2,682,020.64
Missouri.....	6,090	284,254.72
New Mexico.....	1,615	76,511.94
North Carolina.....	24,219	1,159,809.48
Oklahoma.....	110,444	5,221,111.94
South Carolina.....	96,225	5,047,123.39
Tennessee.....	8,082	397,415.76
Texas.....	1,171,334	56,349,083.24
Virginia.....	237	11,465.10
Total.....	1,971,527	95,051,623.33
Loans by cooperatives.....	268,452	12,915,433.65
Total.....	2,239,979	107,967,056.98

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States and its taxpayers operating through the Commodity Credit Corporation must pay warehouse charges covering storage and insurance on the cotton while stored, and the Commodity Credit Corporation has up to date, in my opinion, acted in accordance with the law in trying to have this cotton stored and insured at as reasonable a rate as open competitive bids will obtain that service for the United States Government and for farmers who have equities in the cotton stored. For this the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be commended.

When Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives give their assistance to warehouse companies to prevent open competitive bids, in my opinion, we are striking at the very heart and the very bloodstream of honest Government administration on the part of our Government agencies.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 2, 1940, pages 13796-13800, the Members of the House will find certain information. They will find a resolution which reads:

Resolved, That the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture be, and they are hereby, requested not to ask more or, if already asked for, not to receive bids or make contracts for the reconcentration or rewarehousing of cotton in the Southern Cotton States until the matter can be taken up and considered by the Congress at its ensuing January session.

Now, what was that all about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It looks like a monopoly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is worse than a monopoly. The Commodity Credit Corporation called for open bids under date of November 8, for the purpose of obtaining rates under which to store this Government-owned cotton; not just the farmer-owned cotton, as the debate would lead the unsuspecting public to believe and as certain warehouse operators would lead Members of Congress to believe. I am talking about the rates on Government-owned cotton, as shown by these inventory sheets, 6,300,000 bales.

On November 8, 1940, the Commodity Credit Corporation sent out sheets similar to this I hold in my hand, inviting warehousemen to submit bids for the storage of all cotton, except that from the 1940 crop which is now being harvested, either owned or held as security for loans by the Corporation.

Bids must be submitted prior to noon November 22, 1940, and the rates offered in bids accepted will be effective from December 1, 1940.

The invitations for bids are limited to warehouses located in the cotton-producing areas and ports adjacent thereto.

Why was not New England included in this statement? Apparently, because as stated by Commodity Credit Corporation:

Cotton stored in these areas is readily available for distribution to all domestic consuming centers and export markets without the loss of transportation expenses.

Following the release of that press notice and the sending out of the invitation to bid and contract forms attached, there are three different types, one where you would bid on storage charges on cotton to be continued in storage; another, where you would bid on storage charges on cotton to be continued in storage and additional cotton to be shipped by Commodity Credit Corporation which you might wish to store in your warehouse; and another type of contract covering reconcentrated cotton or cotton transferred from one warehouse to your warehouse. These bids were to be back not later than November 22, 1940, and they state here, "The bids will be opened on November 22. Each bidder will be notified by a letter postmarked not later than December 16, 1940."

What happened after these requests were mailed out? This group of warehousemen came up here in a flock and began their nefarious work here on this hill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe those warehousemen thought they had formed a union and were entitled to the sole privilege of storing cotton for the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will read this debate in the Record he will come to the conclusion that they thought perhaps they had greater power than that, because if there ever was a scandal spread over this hill I contend this is one. I do not propose to let it go by without branding it exactly what I think it is.

I think we can get plenty of support to break this thing so that it will not revive this question in the next session of Congress because about a year ago this thing came up on the floor of the House and it was completely licked for the time being. This time, however, it was carried to the other body and the Warehouse "Gang" got away with it the second time by having the Senate resolution passed.

You must keep in mind that this Government owns over 6,300,000 bales of cotton outright. This cotton does not belong to the farmers of this country in any way, shape, form, or fashion. It has been taken over lock, stock, and barrel. The cotton in that situation is cotton in which the farmer could not have any equity later on. The United States Government is the largest holder of cotton in the world today. One of these warehouse companies I understand holds over 2,500,000 bales of cotton in its various plants in the Mississippi Valley and it apparently objects to the building of warehouses for storing cotton by any other warehouse company in its territory.

I refer you to the Federal Trade Commission Complaint Docket No. 4090. It has protested against the United States Government agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation,

seeking competitive bids for the warehousing of this cotton; and in many cases we have probably paid that outfit enough storage on cotton to pay for the warehouses, lock, stock, and barrel, in which the cotton is stored. At the present time we have some cotton in these warehouses that has been stored since 1935 and on which we have paid perhaps \$10 per bale storage. I happen to know enough about contracting and building to know that I could build a warehouse to store cotton at a considerably less cost than \$10 per bale.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I shall be pleased to yield because I want this to be a wide-open discussion, if we can get it.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Will the gentleman relate the procedure in detail by which the cotton is placed in these warehouses, the manner in which it is stored? In other words, will he trace the cotton from the farmer to the warehouse? I understood the gentleman to say that the farmer has no interest whatsoever in this cotton.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The farmer has no interest in certain of this cotton. Do not misunderstand me. The farmer has no interest in the 6,300,000 bales which is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The farmer does not have an equity in that cotton.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Does he not still have a contingent equity?

Mr. CRAWFORD. None at all, not in that particular balage. There are 4,000,000 or more other bales in which he has an equity.

Mr. SHERIDAN. In whom does the title to this cotton repose?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It rests in the Commodity Credit Corporation, the United States Government. I now refer to the more than 6,300,000 bales.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Is it not there as collateral against loans to farmers?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not.

There are about 2,000,000 bales, in round figures, of the 1938 crop in which the farmer has an equity. There are about 20,000 bales of the 1939 crop and 2,239,979 bales of the 1940-41 balage in which the farmer has an equity, but this cotton is in addition to the 6,300,000-some-odd bales.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said the storage charge already amounted to \$10 per bale.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do not misunderstand me. This is a technical subject. I say we have paid as much as \$10 a bale on some cotton which is now in storage.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is cotton worth in the open market?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not sure whether it is 9 or 9.5 cents a pound.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many pounds in a bale?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are 478 pounds of lint cotton to a bale.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was just wondering whether it would not be cheaper to give the cotton away than to continue to store it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You will find that as a result of what we did on this floor last fall we thought we had this combination broken up.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has already indicated that over \$10,000,000 per year is being saved on the cost of warehousing the cotton stocks already on hand as a result of those reductions we brought about by what happened some months ago on the floor of the House. The Commodity Credit Corporation was at that time criticized for some of the excess charges that were being made prior to that, wherein we were paying as high as 25 cents per bale per month, or \$3 a year. Certain Members of the House from the cotton-growing South criticized the Commodity Credit Corporation for having done that; and now the Commodity Credit Corporation comes along in an attempt to bring about a further saving, and lo and behold all of this situation develops here within the last few days and this resolution is enacted in the other body of this Congress.



I have here the November 1940 report on the cotton situation.

This shows, for instance, in the 1929-38 period you were exporting about 6.3 million bales of cotton per annum. In 1939 you exported 6,192,000 bales. In August to October 1939 you dropped to 1,744,000 bales, and in August to October 1940 you dropped to 350,000 running bales.

Your cotton exports are disappearing. The cotton is piling up in the warehouses, and yet this crowd comes up here and says, "You must not ask for competitive bids on the storing of this cotton." Who is running the United States? Is it this combination of warehousemen, some of whom the Federal Trade Commission has had to file complaints against?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may insert in the RECORD comments from Docket 4090 of the Federal Trade Commission, which is a case of the Federal Trade Commission against some of this group I am referring to. These will be brief excerpts covering perhaps two and a half pages of single-space typewritten matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

PAR. 5. Said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and said respondent, R. L. Taylor, acting in cooperation with each other and through and in cooperation with the other respondents herein named, for more than 4 years last past, and particularly since February 27, 1936, have entered into and carried out and continued and are now engaged in an understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy among themselves and with and through the other respondents herein named to restrict, restrain, and suppress competition in the compressing and storing of cotton and in the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection with the compressing of cotton, and to create and maintain a monopoly in the compressing of cotton and the sale of jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection therewith, in the respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.

PAR. 6. Pursuant to said understanding, agreement, combination or conspiracy, and in furtherance thereof, the said respondents have done and performed and still do and perform the following acts and things:

(1) Respondents, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and R. L. Taylor, have caused to be erected and have operated and do now operate cotton gins, charging fees for ginning which are below the prevailing fees of competitors in the same territory and are below the actual cost of operation, for the purpose of and with the effect of driving competitors out of business and of securing the cotton so ginned for respondents' various compress plants, and to enable respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., at its compress plants to sell the jute or burlap bagging and steel bands or ties sold and used in connection with the compressing of said cotton;

(2) Have attempted to induce and have induced customers of competitive compress plants to transfer their cotton to the compress plants of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., by means of rebates in the form of drayage allowances granted to said customers;

(3) Have, at cotton gins owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., directly or indirectly through respondent, R. L. Taylor, refused to transfer or forward cotton ginned at said gins to compress plants other than compress plants owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co.;

(4) Have transferred from cotton gins owned or controlled by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., directly or indirectly through respondent, R. L. Taylor, cotton which has been ginned to compress plants owned by said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., without regard to, and against the direction and orders of the owners of said cotton;

(5) Have sought to obtain control of competing compress plants through the purchase from its stockholders of their holdings in the corporations operating said plants for the purpose of driving said competitive compress plants out of business;

(6) Have, through the individual respondents, Binford Hester, E. F. Wade, and Winston E. Cheairs, all of whom are officers of respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., and through the individual respondents, W. Dennis Brown and Fred Schneider, all acting as agents of said respondent, Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., attempted to acquire the stock of competing compress plants by means of threats and statements made to the owners of such stock in competing compress plants to the effect that the stock of said competitive compress plants which are generally owned by cotton growers and independent gin operators, will decline in value and be made worthless as a result of the activities of the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in erecting competitive gins and ginning cotton at figures below cost of operation, or free of charge, if such a course shall prove necessary to secure the cotton, and by the allowance of drayage and other rebates. By means of said threats and statements, the respondents have caused great concern, anxiety, mental stress and worry to stockholders in said competitive compress plants, and have caused cotton ginners and cotton growers to send their cotton to the compress plants of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. for the purpose of compressing, and

having added thereto bagging and ties as hereinbefore described, rather than to competitive compress plants in which said ginners and independent cotton growers are stockholders;

(7) Have made threats to owners of cotton gins that they would erect cotton gins and gin cotton below cost or free of charge in competition with said independent cotton gins unless the owners thereof shipped the cotton so ginned by them to compress plants owned by the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in preference to competing compress plants;

(8) Have, by threats to erect cotton gins and operate the same below cost or free of charge, caused the owners of cotton gins who were also stockholders in compress plants owned by competitors of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co., to ship the cotton ginned by said gins and owned or controlled by the ginners to compress plants of Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. in preference to compress plants in which ginners were financially interested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is to let you see what is going on in connection with this combination I am talking about.

This report on cotton also shows approximately half of our exports of cotton formerly went to the continent of Europe. This year, were it not for Russia taking 54,000 bales, our exports to the Continent would be less than 1 percent of the total. Exports of cotton to the Orient have greatly declined in size and relative importance. Exports for the first 3 months of the 1940-41 season were only one-fifth as large as in the same period of last season, and that condition prevails at a time when we have more cotton in storage, insofar as I know, than at any previous time in the history of the world.

This firm to which I refer has a special write-up in what is known as Warehouse Flashes, published November 16, 1940, "for members only." I suppose that is members of the Warehouse Association.

It goes ahead and points out that this firm was organized in the year 1887 by one R. L. Taylor and the late Joe Newberger. From this humble beginning, with a single plant, the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. has grown until it boasts of 88 plants. The organization is not only the largest of its kind in the world, but also owns the largest single plant in the world, the West Memphis plant, which covers 175 acres of ground and will accommodate about a half million bales.

I put this in for you to read in connection with the debates that occurred on the floor of the other body, and I ask you to read that debate along with this data which I am inserting and arrive at your own conclusions, because the debate proceeds in such a way that would lead the unsuspecting public to believe that this whole case hinges around some 92,000 bales of cotton that happened to find itself down in west Texas without a warehouse into which to crawl, and the presentation is made as if all of the people on earth were being crucified by these competitive bids that are being asked for. The debate would also lead you to believe that the only people affected are the small owners of certain warehouses located in the producing areas. This 88-plant octopus is the real force behind this protest against asking for competitive bids.

When the bids on February 10, 1940, were called for the purpose of storing approximately 300,000 bales of cotton up in the New England area, not a single Member of this Congress made a protest. Where were all of these people who are now so vociferously protesting when these bids were sent out for the 300,000 bales? They did not show up. I am serving notice on the cotton section of the South that it is time for them to clean house in this respect, because no longer does the South only hold cotton. I repeat that the Eighth District of Michigan has an interest in at least 6,300,000 bales, and I do not propose to add my approval to a racket in cotton, sugar, or any other basic commodity, as the Government corporations acquire these vast holdings and, in my opinion, we have just started into the woods.

The debate indicates there was a great delegation of farmers up here that sat in on these conferences that have been held in the last few days. "There was no difference of opinion expressed at the meeting held the other day at the Department of Agriculture," the debate says. There were 10 Senators from the Southern States present at the meeting; there were 15 or 20 Representatives present and there were most impressive delegations of farmers present.

Do you know how many farmers were present? Three.  
[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed there were three farmers present, and that two of those three were among the 10 largest cotton producers in the world. I am also informed that those producers were put in the sweat box by the warehouse gang and led to believe that unless somebody speaking in the name of a farmer or farmers came up here and added their support to kill the asking for these competitive bids the warehouse gang would raise the storage charges on the farmers' cotton. That is going just a little bit too far, and I think when you look into the record you will find those three particular farmers, so-called, very much regret that they got hooked in on this proposal. I think you will also find that there is a general protest in the area for which those three so-called farmers spoke against their ever appearing here as protestants against reducing the cost of carrying cotton. So that might be worth looking into. And, furthermore, why should there have been a difference of opinion in the particular group that turned on the heat? The opposition was not invited into the conference, and by the opposition I mean those warehousemen who are willing to reduce the costs of warehousing and insurance to farmers, the taxpayers, and the Government. Oh, no; the warehouse gang would not have this group sitting in on their conference. Why was this important phase of the discussion overlooked by the honorable gentlemen of another body of this Congress? Well, the record speaks for itself. This was the same old warehouse gang that put through the 25 cents per bale per month charge when they know very well new warehouses are being built on basis of profitable operations charging only 12½ cents per bale per month for warehousing and insurance instead of the 25 cents previously charged.

Is this Congress going to take the position with Government agencies that they shall not ask for competitive bids on these services and goods the Government buys? Is this Congress going to take the position that every time a Government agency has sense and judgment and administrative ability enough to go out and ask for competitive bids we are going to come in here and pass resolutions condemning them and say, "Oh, no; you must not go ahead with this until Congress has a chance to act separately the 1st of January"?

In my opinion, that is one of the most vicious steps ever taken by a body of the Congress of the United States. I do not like it a little bit. The people of my district do not like it a little bit. There is not a straight-shooting businessman in the United States who deals with his cards above the table who likes that kind of procedure, because if Government is to do its trading in the absence of competitive bids there is no foundation on which to stand. Such a system would become a cutthroat, knock-down and drag-out proposition, and the man gets the business who can pay the biggest price for it instead of one who can give the best service at the least money.

I have satisfied myself that the Members of the other body did not inform themselves on this question, and I will leave that to your good judgment after you look into it yourself. I hope the Members from the cotton section will take this floor this afternoon and try to unfold this thing or try to dispute what I have said, if it is subject to being disputed, so that we may proceed to smoke this thing out once and for all.

The chances are that instead of the Commodity Credit Corporation going ahead now with this open, competitive bid procedure, and notifying these warehouses who have divulged their information and submitted their bids, and accepting the lowest bid, the situation will work out about like this. After the Secretary of Agriculture gets back into the city and a few of the other officials get back into the city, I believe if you watch the doors down there you will find that several Members of the House and Senate will run to the Secretary of Agriculture and will attempt to fix this

thing up in such a way that those contracts will not be closed under date of December 16. If that occurs, certainly this thing will become a disgraceful act on the part of the Congress and the administrative machinery of this great Nation. That is no way to do business. That is bucket-shop operation if there ever was any. We have no business letting a practice like that start. I hope and trust that the Congress—House and Senate—will permit the Department of Agriculture, along with the decent fellows in the cotton industry—because there are decent fellows in all these big, basic commodities; I know a lot of them, and I know just enough of them to know that they are not in favor of this kind of bucket-shop operation—to clean this situation up before the 1st of January, so that the Committees on Agriculture of the House and the other body and the Committee on Banking and Currency, that handles this situation in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation, will not have to deal with it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. POWERS, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. CAMP, for several days, on account of illness in his family.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet the following Thursday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there may be some developments in the foreign situation, and I object for the present.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6324. An act to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 9, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2044. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, transmitting a copy of the minutes of the twentieth national convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War (H. Doc. No. 985); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2045. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the name, address, and amount of payment to each person receiving \$1,000 or more under the 1938 programs administered under provision of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2046. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made under the provision of the act of March 5, 1940 (Public, No. 426, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of lists of papers by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2048. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by



the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2049. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2050. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2051. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of list of papers by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2052. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of list of motion-picture films by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2053. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of list of motion-picture films by the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2054. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of list of papers by the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2055. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of list of papers by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2056. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2057. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2058. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2059. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2060. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2061. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2062. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2063. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of lists of papers by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 618. Joint resolution extending the time for submitting the final report of the Temporary Economic Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 3099). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 3204. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum; with amendment (Rept. No. 3100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 3596. An act to enable Eva Sofia Bildstein and her minor son, Jorg Bildstein, to remain permanently in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 3101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 4236. An act for the relief of Ida Valeri; without amendment (Rept. No. 3102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6966. A bill for the relief of Maurice Victor; with amendment (Rept. No. 3103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AUSTIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 3087. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman; with amendment (Rept. No. 3104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AUSTIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 3442. An act to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Minas Kirillidis; with amendment (Rept. No. 3105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AUSTIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 4085. An act for the relief of Max von der Porten and his wife Charlotte von der Porten; without amendment (Rept. No. 3106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AUSTIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 4227. An act for the relief of Herbert Zucker, Emma Zucker, Hanni Zucker, Dorrit Claire Zucker, and Martha Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 3107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9105) granting a pension to Lillie Southard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 10717. A bill to render effective the right to work and to prevent interference with the Government defense program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 10718. A bill to provide for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Sixteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to prepare for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution to define the principle of international reciprocity in the protection of American patents, trade-marks, secret formulas and processes, and copyrights by providing a method for assuring the payments of amounts due to persons in the United States from users thereof in countries restricting international payments from their territories; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 642. Resolution providing for a special committee to investigate recent air-line accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 643. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. Res. 644. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DIMOND introduced a bill (H. R. 10719) for the relief of Mrs. P. A. Anderson, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9399. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Memorial of Effie Burd and 103 women of the Michigan State Grange, requesting withdrawal of all entanglements leading to war on foreign soils; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9400. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the membership of the Metropolitan Club of America, Spirit No. 28, Dearborn, Mich., protesting against proposed legislation introduced by Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN providing price and wage fixing on Federal contracts, a gross tax on all incomes of more than \$1,000, and salary cuts for all Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9401. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Mine Workers of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 2420, concerning Federal inspection of coal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

9402. Also, petition of the Greater New York Industrial Union Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor's rights in defense; to the Committee on Labor.

9403. Also, petition of George H. Richter, of Savannah, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9404. Also, petition of the Industrial Insurers' Conference, Atlanta, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to our country's liberty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast made all things for man and hast created man in Thine own image: Do Thou sanctify our souls and bodies, our thoughts and our intentions, that whatsoever we do may by us be designed for Thy glory and for the welfare of this Nation, which, with high and true devotion, we desire to serve. Forbid it, Lord, that any pride or self-seeking, impure motive, unworthy purpose, or low imagination should stain our spirits or unhallow our words and actions.

Breathe upon us, we beseech Thee, and keep alive in us that holy flame which the blessed Christ came to kindle upon earth among men, that, being anointed with the spirit of peace, holiness, and true obedience, we may find the consummation of our service in true fellowship with Thee and Thy children everywhere. In our Saviour's name we ask it. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MINTON and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, December 5, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore of the House during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3765. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes;

S. 3934. An act authorizing the State of Michigan acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada;

S. 4135. An act to legalize the construction by the State Highway Board of Georgia of a free highway bridge across the Withlacocchee River, between Valdosta, Ga., and Madison, Fla., at Horns Ferry; and

S. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution extending the time for submitting the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House No. 2 to the bill (S. 4370) authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3729) for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) authorizing an increase in the seating capacity for the inaugural ceremonies on January 20, 1941.

#### CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the credentials of HIRAM W. JOHNSON, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of W. WARREN BARBOUR, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of TOM CONNALLY, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of BERKELEY L. BUNKER, appointed by the Governor of the State of Nevada a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Pittman for the remainder of the present term, expiring at noon on January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

#### SENATOR FROM INDIANA—CREDENTIALS

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for filing and notation in the RECORD the credentials of the distinguished Republican who retired me from the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials presented by the Senator from Indiana will be read and placed on file.

The credentials of RAYMOND E. WILLIS, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from that